

EXHIBIT C

BAKER & MCKENZIE**Baker & McKenzie Ltd.**
Attorneys at Law5th Floor and 21st-25th Floors
990 Abdulrahim Place
Rama IV Road, Silom, Bangrak
Bangkok 10500
ThailandTel: +66 2636 2000
Fax: +66 2636 2111
bangkok.info@bakermckenzie.com
www.bakermckenzie.com**Asia Pacific**Bangkok
Beijing
Brisbane
Hanoi
Ho Chi Minh City
Hong Kong
Jakarta*
Kuala Lumpur*
Manila*
Melbourne
Seoul
Shanghai
Singapore
Sydney
Taipei
Tokyo
Yangon**Europe, Middle East
& Africa**Abu Dhabi
Almaty
Amsterdam
Antwerp
Bahrain
Baku
Barcelona
Berlin
Brussels
Budapest
Cairo
Casablanca
Doha
Dubai
Dusseldorf
Frankfurt/Main
Geneva
Istanbul
Jeddah*
Johannesburg
Kyiv
London
Luxembourg
Madrid
Milan
Moscow
Munich
Paris
Prague
Riyadh*
Rome
St. Petersburg
Stockholm
Vienna
Warsaw
Zurich**Latin America**Bogota
Brasilia**
Buenos Aires
Caracas
Guadalajara
Juarez
Lima
Mexico City
Monterrey
Porto Alegre**
Rio de Janeiro**
Santiago
Sao Paulo**
Tijuana
Valencia**North America**Chicago
Dallas
Houston
Miami
New York
Palo Alto
San Francisco
Toronto
Washington, DC

* Associated Firm

** In cooperation with
Trench, Rossi e Watanabe
Advogados**Certificate of Accuracy of Translated Document**

1. I am an employee of Baker & McKenzie, Ltd., in Bangkok, Thailand. My job title is translator and my job responsibilities are to translate documents from English to Thai and vice versa.
2. My education background is Bachelor's Degree in English language from Thammasat University, Thailand. I am fluent in both written and spoken Thai and English.
3. I was asked to prepare an English translation of Supreme Court Judgment No. 9435/2554 dated October 26, 2011 (Criminal), which was originally written in Thai.
4. I make this statement to certify that the English translation of the Court Judgment identified above that is attached hereto is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate and complete translation into the English language.
5. By my signature below, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: August 11, 2016

(Rukmini Inwood)

(Translation)

(Official Emblem)

(31 bis)

For Court Use

Judgment

In the Name of His Majesty the King

Ref. No. 9435/2554

Supreme Court

26 October 2011

Criminal Litigation

between

Mr. Sompote Saengduenchai

Plaintiff

vs.

Pro-Link Co., Ltd., Defendant No. 1

Defendants

Mr. Sampote Thientong, Defendant No. 2

Re: Defamation

The Plaintiff filed a dika appeal against the judgment of the Court of Appeal dated 16 May 2007. The Supreme Court accepted the appeal on 20 November 2007.

(31 bis)

(Official Emblem)

For Court Use

The Plaintiff filed a complaint describing Defendant No. 1 as a juristic person categorized as a limited company, with Defendant No. 2 as its authorized director, who acts on behalf of Defendant No. 1. The Plaintiff is the creator and owner of the copyright of the Ultraman Millennium character which was first distributed in Thailand in 2001. On 16 August 2002, the Department of Environmental Quality Promotion sent an invitation letter to the Plaintiff to bring Ultraman Millennium to join the 2002 National Science Week Event No. 19, at the Impact Exhibition Center, Muang Thong Thani, on 18 and 23 August 2002, under the theme "Ultraman for the Environment" to encourage young people to understand the importance of joint protection and conservation of the environment. On 22 August 2002, both Defendants jointly sent a letter to the director-general of the Department of Environmental Quality Promotion, Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, requesting the suspension of the show, claiming that Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. appointed Defendant No. 1 as the authorized agent who was granted the exclusive rights to Ultraman Dyna, Ultraman Tiga, Ultraman Gaia, and Ultraman Cosmos, and authorized Defendant No. 2 as the agent to explain the relevant facts. They would like to give clarification on the imitation of the characteristics of the aforementioned Ultraman characters because it was known that the Plaintiff showed Ultraman Millennium at the 2002 National Science Week No. 19. It was explained that the Plaintiff's Ultraman originated from the imitation of the new series of characters of Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. For example, the blue eyes that are from Ultraman Powered and the stripe-shaped head from Ultraman Cosmos. The imitation work is beyond the disputed agreement between the Plaintiff and Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. on which the Central Intellectual Property and International Trade Court (the "**Central IP & IT Court**") rendered its verdict on 4 April 2000 that the Plaintiff shall have the rights to Ultraman characters from nine movies. This was because previously the Plaintiff had been using the opportunity to seek benefits from the Ultraman works even though the case between the Plaintiff and Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. regarding copyright in the Ultraman works was not finished and was still under consideration by the Supreme Court. If Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. won the case, not only agencies that gave sponsorship would be affected, but Thailand would also be disgraced worldwide. It was therefore requested that the show of characters of Tsuburaya Production's Co., Ltd. in the aforementioned event be suspended. As a result, the director-general of the Department of Environmental Quality Promotion believed the false claim of both Defendants and ordered the suspension of the Plaintiff's show. The action of both Defendants is imputation against the Plaintiff before a third person in a manner likely to impair both the personal and commercial reputation of the Plaintiff or to expose the Plaintiff to hatred or contempt. The incident occurred in Sam Sen Nai Subdistrict, Phaya Thai District, Bangkok. It was requested that both Defendants be punished pursuant to sections 83, 91 and 326 of the Penal Code and

that both Defendants publish the court judgment in all newspapers distributed in Thailand for seven consecutive days and the costs for such publication should be paid for by both Defendants.

The Court of First Instance conducted a preliminary examination and found that the case was founded and the complaint should be accepted.

Both Defendants gave their answer denying the allegations in the complaint.

The Court of First Instance considered that case and ruled that both Defendants are guilty under section 83 and section 326 of the Penal Code. Defendant No. 1 was fined Baht 10,000 and Defendant No. 2 sentenced to three-month jail term and fined Baht 10,000. It was not found that Defendant No. 2 had been punished with imprisonment before so the sentence was suspended for one year. If they failed to pay the fines, action pursuant sections 29 and 30 would be taken. The rest of the request was dismissed.

Both Defendants appealed.

The Court of Appeal rendered a verdict reversing the judgment, dismissing the Plaintiff's complaint.

The Plaintiff filed a dika appeal.

The Supreme Court examined the case and convened a meeting to discuss the case. It found that there was an issue to be considered based on the dika appeal of the Plaintiff. It must be decided whether both Defendants committed an offense as claimed in the complaint. The facts are conclusive in the dika stage that prior to the occurrence of the incident in this case, Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd., a Japanese juristic person, based on the evidence adduced by both Defendants, that authorized both Defendants to be its agents in Thailand, and the Plaintiff had a disputed court case both in Japan and in Thailand regarding the rights to the Ultraman works in Thailand. Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. filed a complaint against the Plaintiff et al., totaling four persons, as defendants, with the Plaintiff as Defendant No. 2, with the Central IP & IT Court, to demand that the Plaintiff be liable in both civil and criminal aspects. It was claimed that the Plaintiff et al. infringed the copyright of the Ultraman works of Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. The Plaintiff denied the allegation and filed a counterclaim demanding damages from the company by claiming that the Plaintiff has the right in the disputed Ultraman works under the licensing agreement, submitted as Exhibit Jor. 2, which Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. claimed to be a forged document. On 4 April 2000, the Central IP & IT Court issued its verdict as per Exhibit Lor. 1. It was decided that the licensing agreement, marked Exhibit Jor. 2, is an agreement actually executed by Mr. Noboru Tsuburaya, authorized director of Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd., with the Plaintiff and it is not a forged document. Therefore, the Plaintiff has the right as specified in Exhibit Jor. 2 in all respects. The complaint of Tsuburaya Productions Co.,

Ltd. was dismissed, both in the civil case and criminal case and it was ordered that the company pay damages in accordance with the counterclaim of Baht 12,000,000 together with interest thereon to the Plaintiff. Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. and the Plaintiff both filed an appeal against the aforementioned judgment with the Supreme Court. During the consideration by the Supreme Court with respect to that case, the incident in this case occurred. During the consideration by the Supreme Court of this case, the Supreme Court in the main case rendered Supreme Court Judgment No. 7457/2550 dated 14 November 2007. The Central IP & IT Court read that judgment to the litigants on 5 February 2008. Two facts in relation to this case were conclusive in that case. The first one is that Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. is the creator of Ultraman or "Yod Manut" movies and applied arts which were distributed for the first time in Japan in 1966 and in subsequent years in Japan. Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. is therefore the owner of the copyright to the Ultraman works under the complaint, which is protected under the laws of Thailand because both Thailand and Japan are members of the same international convention on copyright protection. At the time of the occurrence of the incident, the aforementioned case remained under copyright protection. The Plaintiff (Defendant No. 2 in that case) did not put in money or effort or participate in the creation of or jointly create the Ultraman works. It is therefore inadmissible that the Plaintiff collaborated with Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. in initially creating the Ultraman works. The second issue is that the licensing agreement, submitted as Exhibit Lor. 10 (which is Exhibit Jor. 2 in this case) is an entirely forged document. As a result, the Plaintiff has no right to seek any benefit from the Ultraman works under that document. It is deemed that since it is the final judgment of the Supreme Court, in which the litigants have adduced their evidence and admitted that legal action was taken until the Supreme Court rendered the judgment, it would be admissible that both facts were conclusive as per the aforementioned judgment of the Supreme Court. The Plaintiff filed a complaint in this case stating that the Plaintiff is the creator and owner of copyright of the Ultraman Millennium character and distributed the work for the first time in Thailand in 2001, and continuously thereafter until the present. The Plaintiff adduced evidence that in addition to being the creator of Ultraman works jointly with Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd., the Plaintiff has also been assigned the rights to Ultraman works worldwide, except Japan, from Tsuburaya Productions Co., Ltd. for no definite period in accordance with the licensing agreement, submitted as Exhibit Jor. 2. However, both facts claimed by the Plaintiff as grounds for filing a complaint against both Defendants in this case were concluded in accordance with the final judgment of the Supreme Court and it has been decided that the Plaintiff is not the creator of the Ultraman works from the beginning and that the licensing agreement as per Exhibit Jor. 2 is an entirely forged document. Therefore, it must be deemed that the Plaintiff claims the right by falsely claiming that he is the co-creator and using the forged document of title in bad faith. Therefore, the Plaintiff is not a legally injured party and had no right to file the complaint. Even if this fact appears during the hearing stage of the Supreme Court, the standing to file a complaint is a question of law in relation to public order. Even if no litigant raises it from the beginning, the

Supreme Court deems it expedient to raise it for a decision in order to be consistent with the facts pursuant to paragraph two of section 195 and section 225 of the Penal Procedure Code. It is not necessary to further consider the content as described in the Plaintiff's dika appeal as to whether the action of both Defendants is defamation against the Plaintiff. The Court of Appeal rendered a verdict dismissing the Plaintiff's complaint as it decided that that both Defendants were not guilty on the charge of defamation because they acted in good faith, by way of self justification or defense, or for the protection of a legitimate interest and therefore are protected under section 329 (1) of the Penal Code. The Supreme Court agrees with the effect of the aforementioned judgment. The dika appeal of the Plaintiff is unreasonable.

The judgment is affirmed.

Mr. Surasak Kittiponpattana

Mr. Vorapoj Wilachon

Mr. Anan Choomwisoot

Dusit District Court

8 March 2012

The hearing of the judgment of the Supreme Court was scheduled for today. Defendant No. 2, in his personal capacity and in the capacity of an authorized director who acts on behalf of Defendant No. 1, and the lawyers for both Defendants appeared. The Plaintiff was duly informed of the appointment but did not appear.

The Supreme Court's judgment was read to both Defendants and it is deemed that the Plaintiff has legally acknowledged the Supreme Court's judgment.

The reading was reported.

-signature-

Miss Siripat Pamanow

-not present- Plaintiff

-signature- Defendant No. 1

-signature- Defendant No. 2

-signature- lawyer for both Defendants